REMARKS

In view of the above amendments and the following remarks, reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

I. Amendments to the Claims

Claims 56-62 and 65-71 have been amended to clarify features of the invention recited therein and to further distinguish the present invention from the references relied upon in the rejections discussed below.

Support for these amendments can be found, at least, in Figs. 6-9 and pages 11-14 of the originally filed specification.

II. 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) Rejection

Claims 56-63 and 65-72 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Baker (U.S. 2004/0190687), Kivimaki (U.S. 7,174,295) and Tognazzi (U.S. 5,850,211). This rejection is believed clearly inapplicable to amended independent claims 56-62 and 65-71 and the claims that depend therefrom for the following reasons.

Claims 56 and 65. Amended independent claims 56 and 65 recite obtaining a size of characters included in a displayed text message, wherein a delay time is estimated based on a previously determined relationship between the obtained size of the characters and the delay time, such that (i) the estimated delay time decreases as the obtained size of the characters increases, and (ii) the estimated delay time increases as the obtained size of the characters decreases.

Initially, please note that the above-described 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection acknowledges that Baker and Kivimaki fail to disclose or suggest the features related to the determining of the delay time, as recited in previously presented claims 56 and 65. In light of the above, the present rejection relies on Tognazzi for teaching the above-mentioned features that are admittedly lacking from Baker and Kivimaki. However, in view of the above-identified amendments to claims 56 and 65, which clarify the determining of the delay time based on the size of the characters, it is submitted that Tognazzi fails to disclose or suggest the above-mentioned distinguishing features related to the determining of the delay time, as now required by claims 56 and 65.

Rather, Tognazzi merely teaches determining a length of time necessary for a user to visually recognize characters based on the user's eye movements detected by an eye-tracker, in order to determine an appropriate window scrolling speed (see abstract). Specifically, Tognazzi teaches that when reading an electronic newspaper the scrolling speed is adjusted based on the reading speed of the user by detecting a difference between a location of the user's eyes on the electronic newspaper and a reference position on the electronic newspaper (see col. 2, lines 32-37, and col. 5, lines 25-45). As a result, if the user is reading the article fast because the article is related to a subject that is familiar to the user, then the scrolling speed will be increased, based on the eye-tracker, in order to keep up with the user's reading speed; whereas, if the user is reading the article slowly because the article is related to a subject that is not familiar to the user, then the scrolling speed will be decreased, based on the eye-tracker, in order for the scrolling to remain commensurate with the reading speed.

Thus, in view of the above, it is clear that Tognazzi teaches using an eye-tracker to determine the scrolling speed based on a relationship between a location of the user's eyes and a

reference position, but fails to disclose or suggest obtaining a size of characters included in a displayed text message, wherein a delay time is estimated based on a previously determined relationship between the obtained size of the characters and the delay time, such that (i) the estimated delay time decreases as the obtained size of the characters increases, and (ii) the estimated delay time increases as the obtained size of the characters decreases, as recited in claims 56 and 65.

In other words, Tognazzi teaches adjusting the scrolling based on the user's reading speed, which is completely different from detecting the size of the characters of the displayed text and determining the delay time based on the obtained size, as required by claims 56 and 65. For example, since claims 56 and 65 require the delay time to be based on the size of the character, then the use of characters of the same size will result in a same delay time. Whereas, according to Tognazzi, the scrolling speed will be different for characters of the same size, because the user's reading speed will change at some point based on the content of the text, despite the same size of the characters.

Furthermore, the Applicants note that the claimed "delay time" is determined in order to schedule an output of a voice message representing the displayed text, such that the voice message will be output sooner if the size of the text is large and the voice message will be output later if the size of the text is small. This above-mentioned feature of adjusting the delay time based on the size of the text, as required by claims 56 and 65, is completely different from the technique disclosed by Tognazzi, which, when combined with the teachings of Baker and Kivimaki, would result in an ever-changing delay, based on the reading speed of the user, between the displaying of the text and the output of the voice message representing the displayed text.

Therefore, for the above-mentioned reasons alone it is believed clear that claims 56 and 65 would not have been obvious or result from any combination of Baker, Kivimaki and Tognazzi.

Claims 57 and 66. Amended independent claims 57 and 66 recite obtaining a distance between a set focal point and a displayed text message, the set focal point being located on a text display unit and for attracting a user's attention, wherein the delay time is estimated based on a previously determined relationship between the obtained distance and the delay time, such that (i) the estimated delay time increases as the obtained distance increases, and (ii) the estimated delay time decreases as the obtained distance decreases.

Initially, please note that the above-described 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection acknowledges that Baker and Kivimaki fail to disclose or suggest the features related to the determining of the delay time, as recited in previously presented claims 57 and 66. In light of the above, the present rejection relies on Tognazzi for teaching the above-mentioned features that are admittedly lacking from Baker and Kivimaki. However, in view of the above-identified amendments to claims 57 and 66, which clarify the determining of the delay time based on the obtained distance between the set focal point and the displayed text message, it is submitted that Tognazzi fails to disclose or suggest the above-mentioned distinguishing features related to the determining of the delay time, as now required by claims 57 and 66.

Rather, as described above, Tognazzi merely teaches using an eye-tracker to determine the scrolling speed based on a relationship between a location of the user's eyes and a reference position. As a result, Tognazzi fails to disclose or suggest obtaining a distance between a set focal point and a displayed text message, the set focal point being located on a text display unit and for attracting a user's attention, wherein the delay time is estimated based on a previously

determined relationship between the obtained distance and the delay time, such that (i) the estimated delay time increases as the obtained distance increases, and (ii) the estimated delay time decreases as the obtained distance decreases, as recited in claims 57 and 66.

Furthermore, the Applicants note that the claimed "delay time" is determined in order to schedule an output of a voice message representing the displayed text, such that the voice message will be output sooner if the distance between the text and the set focal point is small and the voice message will be output later if the distance between the text and the set focal point is large. This above-mentioned feature of adjusting the delay time based on the distance between the text and the set focal point, as required by claims 57 and 66, is completely different from the technique disclosed by Tognazzi, which, when combined with the teachings of Baker and Kivimaki, would result in an ever-changing delay, based on the reading speed of the user, between the displaying of the text and the output of the voice message representing the displayed text.

Therefore, for the above-mentioned reasons alone it is believed clear that claims 57 and 66 and claims 63 and 72 that depend therefrom would not have been obvious or result from any combination of Baker, Kivimaki and Tognazzi.

Claims 58 and 67. Amended independent claims 58 and 67 recite obtaining a contrast between a color at a position on a text display unit and a color of characters included in a displayed text message, wherein a delay time is estimated based on a previously determined relationship between the obtained contrast and the delay time, such that (i) the estimated delay time decreases as the obtained contrast increases, and (ii) the estimated delay time increases as the obtained contrast decreases.

Initially, please note that the above-described 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection acknowledges that Baker and Kivimaki fail to disclose or suggest the features related to the determining of the delay time, as recited in previously presented claims 58 and 67. In light of the above, the present rejection relies on Tognazzi for teaching the above-mentioned features that are admittedly lacking from Baker and Kivimaki. However, in view of the above-identified amendments to claims 58 and 67, which clarify the determining of the delay time based on the obtained contrast, it is submitted that Tognazzi fails to disclose or suggest the above-mentioned distinguishing features related to the determining of the delay time, as now required by claims 58 and 67.

Rather, as described above, Tognazzi merely teaches using an eye-tracker to determine the scrolling speed based on a relationship between a location of the user's eyes and a reference position. As a result, Tognazzi fails to disclose or suggest obtaining a contrast between a color at a position on a text display unit and a color of characters included in a displayed text message, wherein a delay time is estimated based on a previously determined relationship between the obtained contrast and the delay time, such that (i) the estimated delay time decreases as the obtained contrast increases, and (ii) the estimated delay time increases as the obtained contrast decreases, as recited in claims 58 and 67.

Furthermore, the Applicants note that the claimed "delay time" is determined in order to schedule an output of a voice message representing the displayed text, such that the voice message will be output sooner if the contrast is large and the voice message will be output later if the contrast is small. This above-mentioned feature of adjusting the delay time based on the contrast, as required by claims 58 and 67, is completely different from the technique disclosed by Tognazzi, which, when combined with the teachings of Baker and Kivimaki, would result in an

ever-changing delay, based on the reading speed of the user, between the displaying of the text and the output of the voice message representing the displayed text.

Therefore, for the above-mentioned reasons alone it is believed clear that claims 58 and 67 would not have been obvious or result from any combination of Baker, Kivimaki and Tognazzi.

Claims 59 and 68. Amended independent claims 59 and 68 recite obtaining a degree of flashing of characters included in a displayed text message, wherein a delay time is estimated based on a previously determined relationship between the obtained degree of flashing and the delay time, such that (i) the estimated delay time decreases as the obtained degree of flashing increases, and (ii) the estimated delay time increases as the obtained degree of flashing decreases.

Initially, please note that the above-described 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection acknowledges that Baker and Kivimaki fail to disclose or suggest the features related to the determining of the delay time, as recited in previously presented claims 59 and 68. In light of the above, the present rejection relies on Tognazzi for teaching the above-mentioned features that are admittedly lacking from Baker and Kivimaki. However, in view of the above-identified amendments to claims 59 and 68, which clarify the determining of the delay time based on the obtained degree of flashing, it is submitted that Tognazzi fails to disclose or suggest the above-mentioned distinguishing features related to the determining of the delay time, as now required by claims 59 and 68.

Rather, as described above, Tognazzi merely teaches using an eye-tracker to determine the scrolling speed based on a relationship between a location of the user's eyes and a reference position. As a result, Tognazzi fails to disclose or suggest obtaining a degree of flashing of

characters included in a displayed text message, wherein a delay time is estimated based on a previously determined relationship between the obtained degree of flashing and the delay time, such that (i) the estimated delay time decreases as the obtained degree of flashing increases, and (ii) the estimated delay time increases as the obtained degree of flashing decreases, as recited in claims 59 and 68.

Furthermore, the Applicants note that the claimed "delay time" is determined in order to schedule an output of a voice message representing the displayed text, such that the voice message will be output sooner if the degree of flashing is large and the voice message will be output later if the degree of flashing is small. This above-mentioned feature of adjusting the delay time based on the degree of flashing, as required by claims 59 and 68, is completely different from the technique disclosed by Tognazzi, which, when combined with the teachings of Baker and Kivimaki, would result in an ever-changing delay, based on the reading speed of the user, between the displaying of the text and the output of the voice message representing the displayed text.

Therefore, for the above-mentioned reasons alone it is believed clear that claims 59 and 68 would not have been obvious or result from any combination of Baker, Kivimaki and Tognazzi.

Claims 60 and 69. Amended independent claims 60 and 69 recite obtaining an age of a user, wherein a delay time is estimated based on a previously determined relationship between the obtained age and the delay time, such that (i) the estimated delay time increases as the obtained age increases, and (ii) the estimated delay time decreases as the obtained age decreases.

Initially, please note that the above-described 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection acknowledges that Baker and Kivimaki fail to disclose or suggest the features related to the determining of the

delay time, as recited in previously presented claims 60 and 69. In light of the above, the present rejection relies on Tognazzi for teaching the above-mentioned features that are admittedly lacking from Baker and Kivimaki. However, in view of the above-identified amendments to claims 60 and 69, which clarify the determining of the delay time based on the obtained age, it is submitted that Tognazzi fails to disclose or suggest the above-mentioned distinguishing features related to the determining of the delay time, as now required by claims 60 and 69.

Rather, as described above, Tognazzi merely teaches using an eye-tracker to determine the scrolling speed based on a relationship between a location of the user's eyes and a reference position. As a result, Tognazzi fails to disclose or suggest obtaining an age of a user, wherein a delay time is estimated based on a previously determined relationship between the obtained age and the delay time, such that (i) the estimated delay time increases as the obtained age increases, and (ii) the estimated delay time decreases as the obtained age decreases, as recited in claims 60 and 69.

Furthermore, the Applicants note that the claimed "delay time" is determined in order to schedule an output of a voice message representing the displayed text, such that the voice message will be output sooner if the age of the user is small and the voice message will be output later if the age of the user is large. This above-mentioned feature of adjusting the delay time based on the age of the user, as required by claims 60 and 69, is completely different from the technique disclosed by Tognazzi, which, when combined with the teachings of Baker and Kivimaki, would result in an ever-changing delay, based on the reading speed of the user, between the displaying of the text and the output of the voice message representing the displayed text.

Therefore, for the above-mentioned reasons alone it is believed clear that claims 60 and 69 would not have been obvious or result from any combination of Baker, Kivimaki and Tognazzi.

Claims 61 and 70. Amended independent claims 61 and 70 recite obtaining a number of times a user operates a voice output apparatus, wherein a delay time is estimated based on a previously determined relationship between the obtained number of times of operation and the delay time, such that (i) the estimated delay time decreases as the obtained number of times of operation increases, and (ii) the estimated delay time increases as the obtained number of times of operation decreases.

Initially, please note that the above-described 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection acknowledges that Baker and Kivimaki fail to disclose or suggest the features related to the determining of the delay time, as recited in previously presented claims 61 and 70. In light of the above, the present rejection relies on Tognazzi for teaching the above-mentioned features that are admittedly lacking from Baker and Kivimaki. However, in view of the above-identified amendments to claims 61 and 70, which clarify the determining of the delay time based on the obtained number of times of operation, it is submitted that Tognazzi fails to disclose or suggest the above-mentioned distinguishing features related to the determining of the delay time, as now required by claims 61 and 70.

Rather, as described above, Tognazzi merely teaches using an eye-tracker to determine the scrolling speed based on a relationship between a location of the user's eyes and a reference position. As a result, Tognazzi fails to disclose or suggest obtaining a number of times a user operates a voice output apparatus, wherein a delay time is estimated based on a previously determined relationship between the obtained number of times of operation and the delay time,

such that (i) the estimated delay time decreases as the obtained number of times of operation increases, and (ii) the estimated delay time increases as the obtained number of times of operation decreases, as recited in claims 61 and 70.

Furthermore, the Applicants note that the claimed "delay time" is determined in order to schedule an output of a voice message representing the displayed text, such that the voice message will be output sooner if the number of times of operation is large and the voice message will be output later if the number of times of operation is small. This above-mentioned feature of adjusting the delay time based on the number of times of operation, as required by claims 61 and 70, is completely different from the technique disclosed by Tognazzi, which, when combined with the teachings of Baker and Kivimaki, would result in an ever-changing delay, based on the reading speed of the user, between the displaying of the text and the output of the voice message representing the displayed text.

Therefore, for the above-mentioned reasons alone it is believed clear that claims 61 and 70 would not have been obvious or result from any combination of Baker, Kivimaki and Tognazzi.

Claims 62 and 71. Amended independent claims 62 and 71 recite obtaining an operation time during which a user operates a voice output apparatus, wherein a delay time is estimated based on a previously determined relationship between the obtained operation time and the delay time, such that (i) the estimated delay time decreases as the obtained operation time increases, and (ii) the estimated delay time increases as the obtained operation time decreases.

Initially, please note that the above-described 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection acknowledges that Baker and Kivimaki fail to disclose or suggest the features related to the determining of the delay time, as recited in previously presented claims 62 and 71. In light of the above, the present

rejection relies on Tognazzi for teaching the above-mentioned features that are admittedly lacking from Baker and Kivimaki. However, in view of the above-identified amendments to claims 62 and 71, which clarify the determining of the delay time based on the obtained time of operation, it is submitted that Tognazzi fails to disclose or suggest the above-mentioned distinguishing features related to the determining of the delay time, as now required by claims 62 and 71.

Rather, as described above, Tognazzi merely teaches using an eye-tracker to determine the scrolling speed based on a relationship between a location of the user's eyes and a reference position. As a result, Tognazzi fails to disclose or suggest obtaining an operation time during which a user operates a voice output apparatus, wherein a delay time is estimated based on a previously determined relationship between the obtained operation time and the delay time, such that (i) the estimated delay time decreases as the obtained operation time increases, and (ii) the estimated delay time increases as the obtained operation time decreases, as recited in claims 62 and 71.

Furthermore, the Applicants note that the claimed "delay time" is determined in order to schedule an output of a voice message representing the displayed text, such that the voice message will be output sooner if the operation time is large and the voice message will be output later if the operation time is small. This above-mentioned feature of adjusting the delay time based on the time of operation, as required by claims 62 and 71, is completely different from the technique disclosed by Tognazzi, which, when combined with the teachings of Baker and Kivimaki, would result in an ever-changing delay, based on the reading speed of the user, between the displaying of the text and the output of the voice message representing the displayed text.

Therefore, for the above-mentioned reasons alone it is believed clear that claims 62 and 71 would not have been obvious or result from any combination of Baker, Kivimaki and Tognazzi.

Furthermore, there is no disclosure or suggestion in Baker, Kivimaki and/or Tognazzi or elsewhere in the prior art of record which would have caused a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify Baker, Kivimaki and/or Tognazzi to obtain the invention of independent claims 56-62 and 65-71. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that independent claims 56-62 and 65-71 and claims 63 and 72 that depend therefrom are clearly allowable over the prior art of record.

III. Conclusion

In view of the above amendments and remarks, it is submitted that the present application is now in condition for allowance and an early notification thereof is earnestly requested. The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone to resolve any remaining issues.

Respectfully submitted,

Makoto NISHIZAKI et al.

/Andrew L. Dunlap/
2010.06.07 14:14:40 -04'00'

By _____
Andrew L. Dunlap
Registration No. 60,554
Attorney for Applicants

ALD/led
Washington, D.C. 20005-1503
Telephone (202) 721-8200
Facsimile (202) 721-8250
June 7, 2010